DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 129 TM 004 981

AUTHOR Sherwin, Susan S.
TITLE Performance-Based Teacher Education: Results of a Recent Survey.
SPONS AGENCY American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 47p.
AVAILABLE FROM Teacher Programs and Services, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. 08540 ($1.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Data Analysis; Higher Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Program Content; Questionnaires; *School Surveys

ABSTRACT

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) has been very active in the performance-based movement. In the fall of 1972, the AACTE conducted a preliminary survey of 1,250 institutions asking which institutions were operating, investigating and/or planning PBTE programs. Of the 783 respondents (a 63 percent return), 131 (17 percent) said they were operating PBTE programs, 228 (29 percent) said they were not, and a large number, 424 (54 percent), said they were in some stage of investigation. The staff of Teacher Programs and Services at Educational Testing Service, in conjunction with the staff of AACTE drafted a questionnaire, aimed at examining as closely as possible the status of PBTE programs. The questionnaire was reviewed by leading educators in the movement and most suggestions were incorporated. The limitations of a paper and pencil survey are evident; the data provide a quantitative view and raise many more questions than can be answered here. If feasible, sample follow-up visits will be made in order to gain a more qualitative understanding of some of the programs. Nonetheless, the results of the survey provide the most recent and detailed information available on PBTE programs. (Author/DEP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED117129

PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION:

RESULTS OF A RECENT SURVEY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dorothy URBAN(ETS)

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Susan S. Sherwin

Co-sponsored by Teacher Programs and Services of Educational Testing Service
and The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

TM004981

Copyright © 1973 by Educational Testing Service.
All rights reserved.

Prefatory Note

We thank our co-sponsors of this survey, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, for their cooperation, suggestions and encouragement. Special thanks are due to Dr. Karl Massanari and Dr. Gordon Cook for their assistance.

We also thank the following educators for their prompt and thorough review of an initial draft of this survey:

Theodore Andrews, Associate in Teacher Education
State Department of Education, Albany, New York

Caseel Burke, Dean, School of Education
Weber State College, Ogden, Utah

Robert Carbone, College of Education
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

Herbert Hite, Chairman, Department of Education
Western Washington State, Bellingham, Washington

Robert Houston, Bureau of Educational Research
University of Houston, Houston, Texas

Allen Schmieder, Director of Program Thrust '73
United States Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

The following staff of Teacher Programs and Services was involved in the drafting and revisions of the questionnaire: James R. Deneen, Richard M. Majetic, Edward J. Masonis.

Special thanks also go to Margaret S. Parell for the typing of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Introduction and Purpose of Survey..... 1

II The Survey Process..... 4

III Survey Results..... 6

IV Conclusions.....28

V Appendices

Appendix A - Survey.....30

Appendix B - Letters.....39

Appendix C - Quotable Quotes.....41

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Distribution of Responding Institutions According to Control, Size and Geographic Location	5
2.	PBTE and Traditional Programs According to Grade Level or Subject	6
3.	Numbers of Students in PBTE Programs	7
4.	Numbers of Students Graduated from PBTE Programs	7
5.	Frequency of Training Programs for Faculty Among Responding Institutions	8
6.	Response to Question #8 Concerning Teaching Centers Consortia and Groups Involved	9
7.	Frequency of Problems Related to PBTE Programs	10
8.	Frequency of Selection Criteria Used	12
9.	Classification of Expressed Objectives	12
10.	Response to Question #15—PBTE Characteristics	13
11.	Response to Question #16: Which of the following areas of your program are performance-based?	16
12.	Methods Used in Content Development	16
13.	Response to Question #20—To what extent are each of the following used in your PBTE program?	18
14.	Graduation Requirements	21
15.	Frequency of Measures Used for Achievement Levels	23
16.	Grading Practices	24
17.	Curriculum Review	25
18.	Faculty Performance Measures	25
19.	Methods Used for Graduate Feedback	26

INTRODUCTION

As researchers and educators have attempted to examine teacher behavior and understand what constitutes a "good teacher", experimental programs have been developed and tried in many institutions. This exploration is surely a sign of vitality in an important segment of higher education. Educators dissatisfied with the more traditional teacher-training programs, faced with the increasingly critical scrutiny of their programs and the teachers they produce are seeking methods to improve the training of classroom teachers.

One of the new approaches, which began to develop momentum in the sixties, is the performance or competency-based approach to teacher education, which, simply stated, is an attempt to define, understand and replicate the components of good teaching performance in the classroom. Margaret Lindsay in the Journal of Teacher Education[1] gives a more detailed definition: "The process of designing a competency-based program of initial teacher education requires specifying in advance expected outcomes in terms of competencies to be demonstrated by graduates of the program, developing learning opportunities and environments expected to

1. Lindsay, Margaret, "Performance-based Teacher Education: Examination of a Slogan," Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXIV, Fall, 1973, No. 3, p.181.

facilitate students' progress toward specified outcomes, and constructing and using evaluating procedures and instruments directly relevant to the stated competencies." The complex process of designing this type of curriculum is exacting and expensive, but more and more institutions are attempting the task. There are now about one hundred programs in varying stages, and many more are planning them.

Educators, colleges and educational organizations are interested in monitoring these new developments. Some are concerned with larger questions of quality and relative merit of performance-based education; others are concentrating on module development, program management and assessment. All are watching carefully to see whether this is an ephemeral movement or a major breakthrough in teacher education.

Purpose of the Survey

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) has been very active in the performance-based movement.* Their Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education (hereinafter PBTE) headed by Dr. Karl Massanari has sponsored workshops and conferences and has produced an excellent series of booklets on the subject.

In the fall of 1972, the AACTE conducted a preliminary survey of 1,250 institutions asking which institutions were operating, investigating

*There is some disagreement regarding the use of the words performance-based and competency-based. For the purpose of this survey and report, the words are used interchangeably.

and/or planning PBTE programs. Of the 783 respondents (a 63% return), 131 (17%) said they were operating PBTE programs, 228 (29%) said they were not, and a large number, 424 (54%), said they were in some stage of investigation.

Teacher Programs and Services of Educational Testing Service (ETS) is vitally interested in the changes taking place in teacher training. As the coordinators of the National Teacher Examinations (NTE) and the sponsors of various studies on teacher behavior, and as a research-oriented educational organization, ETS is anxious to learn as much as possible about the "state of the art".

Accordingly, the staff of Teacher Programs and Services, in conjunction with the staff of AACTE drafted a questionnaire, aimed at examining as closely as possible the status of PBTE programs. The questionnaire was reviewed by leading educators in the movement and most suggestions were incorporated. The limitations of a paper and pencil survey are evident; the data provide a quantitative view and raise many more questions than can be answered here. If feasible, sample follow-up visits will be made in order to gain a more qualitative understanding of some of the programs. Nonetheless, the results of the survey provide the most recent and detailed information available on PBTE programs.

THE SURVEY PROCESS

The survey is composed of 37 questions, most of which require a checked response; 11 allow for write-in completions or explanations. It is divided into three general areas:

1. General Data - concerning the breakdown of PBTE programs, the numbers of students and faculty and the problems involved in changing over from traditional patterns.
2. Program Characteristics - concerning the details of the programs, goals, methodology, field experiences and module development.
3. Evaluation - concerning the ways in which the students, faculty and programs are reviewed and assessed.

Sample

The survey was mailed on May 4, 1973 to 124 institutions that had identified themselves as having performance-based programs on the initial survey mentioned above. (Those 7 not included arrived late at AACTE.) A follow-up letter was sent on May 31, to those institutions not responding to the first mailing. (See Appendices A and B.)

By June 30, a total of 83 responses or 67% were received. Of these, 75 responses were usable (60%). Of the eight non-usable returns, six respondents indicated that they did not have separate or total performance-

based programs but rather were incorporating ideas about competencies into their existing programs; one institution expects their program to be operative in the spring of 1974 and another said that they were forced to drop their PBTE program and revert to a traditional program due to personnel changes. A telephone sample of non-respondents indicated partial PBTE development and some reluctance to call themselves "performance-based"—similar to some of the respondents included in this report. Many of the responding institutions sent supplementary materials along with their returns which reveal a great deal of activity and vitality in these new programs.

Representativeness

In the 75 usable returns there is a diverse group of institutions represented, as shown by Table 1, according to the criteria of control, size and geographic location:

Table 1

Distribution of Responding Institutions According to Control, Size and Geographic Location

Control		Size		Geographic Location	
Public	- 48 (64%)	Less than 1,000	- 13 (17%)	NE, MA	- 24 (32%)
Private	- 27 (36%)	1,001 - 10,000	- 45 (60%)	MW	- 25 (33%)
		More than 10,000	- 17 (23%)	S, SE	- 11 (15%)
				SW, FW, NW	- 15 (20%)

SURVEY RESULTS

General Data

There are a total of 123 separate PBTE programs operating for the training of teachers for nursery school through grade 8, with 59 parallel programs which were labeled "traditional". This represents the bulk of all the PBTE programs reporting. As shown in Table 2 below, three categories were formed for this grouping,—Nursery-Kindergarten, Grades 1-3, and Grades 4-8,—in order to see more precisely where the changes are taking place. At the secondary level there are 53 programs, with 32 running parallel to traditional programs. Nearly all of the responding institutions have both PBTE and traditional programs available. Some respondents noted that PBTE was an option for their students; others emphasized the partial nature of their program or coursework; still others reported that they were in the embryonic stages of development, and were basing their answers to the questionnaire on planned, rather than actual, programs.

Table 2

PBTE and Traditional Programs According to Grade Level or Subject

Programs	PBTE	"Traditional"
Nursery-Kindergarten	21	8
Early Childhood (1-3)	46	23
Elementary (4-8)	56	28
Secondary	53	32
Special Education	16	24
Guidance Counseling	12	21
Graduate Level Programs	20	32

It should be noted that most of the activity is taking place on the undergraduate level; only Special Education, Guidance Counseling and the Graduate Level show more traditional programs than PBTE programs in the institutions reporting. However, graduate level PBTE is possibly under-represented because universities that have graduate teacher programs only were not solicited.

According to the returns, there are a total of 24,399 students in the performance-based programs in the responding institutions. One of these institutions claims 2,700 or 11% of the total. The distribution is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Number of Students in PBTE Programs

Students	Institutions	%
1-50	18	24%
51-100	17	23%
101-150	7	9%
151+	30	40%
	(N.A. = 4%)	

The number of students completing PBTE programs is shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Number of Students Graduated From PBTE Programs

Students	Institutions	%
0	21	28%
1-50	19	25%
51-100	9	12%
101-150	6	8%
151+	22	29%

The highest single number reported here was 3,000 in one institution, (not the same one mentioned with 11% of the total enrollment). The total number of students graduated is 12,996. Some institutions with multiple programs gave more than one response to this query.

A large proportion of the respondents—71% (53 institutions)—have been operating their PBTE programs less than two years, with 29% (22 institutions) operating longer. Here too, there was some variance for multiple programs within a single institution.

The numbers of faculty involved in PBTE programs varied considerably; 37 programs (49%) had 5 persons or less (using full-time equivalents, i.e., 4 people @ quarter time = 1), 30 had more than 5 (40%) with 8 not responding (11%). One institution said they had 44 staff people involved in their PBTE program.

The response to a question concerning retraining programs for faculty involved in PBTE programs is significant in the numbers, extent and variety of retraining going on. The methods are listed below in order of preference:

Table 5

Frequency of Training Programs for Faculty Among Responding Institutions

	No. of Institutions	%
Informal meetings	58	77%
Conferences	48	64%
Seminars	34	45%
Other (see below)	18	24%
None	7	9%

Only 7 institutions (9%) do not have any formal retraining provisions. Many respondents described workshops, on-the-job assignments, consultant activity and cooperative planning in the space provided for "Other".

When asked to describe training programs available for classroom teachers now working with students from PBTE programs, 12 institutions indicated in-service training, 11 indicated course work offered at their university for classroom teachers, and another 11 said informal meetings and/or seminars were available. Others mentioned videotaped programs, on-site instruction and workshops. Eighteen institutions do not have programs for the classroom teachers.

A notable 73%, or 55 institutions, said they were engaged in or planning a teaching center or consortium arrangement, as shown in the Table below. (A teaching center was defined as "a coordinating site for teacher education where performance criteria are formulated, supervised and evaluated, and/or where research and development are undertaken.")

Table 6

Response to Question #8 Concerning Teaching Centers Consortia and Groups Involved

Teaching Center or Consortium			Groups Involved*		
1. Engaged in	- 30	40%	1. Local School Districts	- 39	71%
2. Planning	- 25	33%	2. Universities & Colleges	- 15	27%
3. No	- 20	27%	3. Local Teacher Associations	- 6	11%

*The percentage used is based upon the number of institutions responding to 1 & 2 (a total of 55) from the column on the left.

Many institutions indicated that two or three school districts were cooperating with their PBTE programs. (One was working with ten school districts.) Other affiliations noted were with State Teacher Associations, School Boards, community groups and students.

A large number of respondents (41) said their training programs had been evaluated and approved by the State Board of Education; 17 said they have not been approved and 29 are approved on a pilot basis. These figures may be misleading, however, since some of the programs described are partial, not total, new programs and the approval may have been given on the basis of the total training programs, or on criteria other than performance-based criteria. (For this reason, perhaps, some institutions checked more than one response here.)

Many problems were encountered in changing from one type of program to another, according to the response to question #10. The problems are listed in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency of Problems Related to PBTE Programs

	No. of Institutions	%
Faculty allocations	50	67%
Financial Support	43	57%
Other (see below)	34	45%
Space Problems	29	39%
Equipment	24	32%
Cooperation of institution	15	20%

Only three institutions indicated no problems at all, all three being new universities where problems would appear more easily avoidable. Other difficulties mentioned involved money—for faculty release time, stipends for summer sessions and tuition, for research, library facilities, etc. Eleven respondents mentioned staff resistance as a factor, both within their own departments and on the university faculty, and a few mentioned the limitations of time placed upon their faculty, noting that performance-based programs require a great deal more time both from the faculty and the students. One respondent wrote in "Energy!!" Another wrote, [the] "largest problem was (and is) with the student who has come up through 13-15 years of structured, traditional education, and now must suddenly assume responsibility for his time management, and his educational activities."

Program Characteristics

The initial question of the second section asked at what stage a student applied for entry into a PBTE program. Twenty-seven institutions answered junior year which is comparable to traditional programs; 9 indicated freshmen year and 21 sophomore year. Seventeen said that entry varies according to the program; four others did not check a particular year at all.

The question immediately following asked how a student gains entry into the PBTE program. The selection criteria and responses are listed in the Table below.

Table 8

Frequency of Selection Criteria Used

Criterion	No. of Institutions	%
Self-selection	45	60%
Interview	36	48%
Recommendations	31	41%
Minimum GPA	31	41%
Counseling	22	29%
Other	18	24%
Examinations	6	8%

Almost all the respondents checked more than one criterion. It is interesting to note that so many institutions checked self-selection, although only 8 of the 45 checked self-selection only.

In order to learn more about the formulation of objectives for a PBTE program, three of the most probable methods of developing objectives were listed. Some institutions checked all three methods, but most checked the first two.

Table 9

Classification of Expressed Objectives

No. of Institutions	Method
65	Performance-based (participant is required to do something rather than simply know something).
52	Cognitive (participant is required to demonstrate knowledge and intellectual abilities).
26	Consequence-based (participant is required to bring about specified performance and/or change in others).
12	Other

A list of characteristics of performance-based programs was taken from Stanley Elam's AACTE pamphlet (which itself was a capsulization of the monograph entitled, "What is the State of the Art?" in the Performance-Based Teacher Education Series, No. 1.); the check list with the number of institutions responding follows below:

Table 10

Response to Question #15—PBTE Characteristics

On the following check-list, please indicate which characteristics are basic to your PBTE program.

Competencies (knowledge, skills, behaviors) demonstrated by the student are:

[54] derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles.
[57] stated so as to permit assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies.
[60] made public in advance.

Criteria employed in assessing competencies are:

[60] based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies.
[40] explicit in stating expected levels of mastery and under specified conditions.
[53] made public in advance.

Assessment of the student's competency:

[61] uses his/her performance as the primary source of evidence.
[47] takes into account student's knowledge relevant to teaching and learning behavior.
[54] strives for objectivity.

Other elements:

[44] The student's rate of progress through the program is demonstrated competency rather than by time or course completion.

[61] The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified.

[59] The emphasis is on exit, not on entrance, requirements.

[54] The program is field-centered.

[41] Instruction moves from mastery of specified techniques to role integration.

Most institutions checked all the items on the list, although some wrote in qualifications, (e.g., "not yet", "sometimes", and "We are trying."). On the last item, for example, which is the most difficult criterion to attain according to Elam, some respondents indicated they were still working on this. The five items checked most frequently specify the core criteria in the PBTE programs responding:

1) made public in advance (60)
2) based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies (60)
3) uses his/her performance as the primary source of evidence (61)
4) the instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified (61)
5) the emphasis is on exit, not on entrance, requirements (59).

The two items least checked on the list indicate some of the problems confronting new performance-based programs:

1) explicit in stating expected levels of mastery and under specified conditions (40)
2) instruction moves from mastery of specified techniques to role integration. (41)

It is difficult to assess or confirm the accuracy of responses to this kind of check-list. There are probably many programs that claim to be performance-based, which use the rhetoric and know the literature, but whose programs may, in fact, fall short of actually fulfilling the elements described on this check-list. It is nonetheless striking to see how many institutions say they are developing along the lines indicated here.

In trying to further explore what components of the responding institutions' curriculums were performance-based, we divided the program into three areas: general studies, subject-matter specialization, and courses in the professional education sequence. Almost all of the respondents, 94.7%, claimed that all or some of their courses in the professional education sequence were performance-based, and where percentages of courses were indicated by respondents, the range was 40% to 80%. For subject-matter specialization and general studies, far fewer institutions have changed or reformulated their courses, though some indicated they hope to do so.

Table 11

Response to Question #16

Which of the following areas of your program are performance-based?

	All	Some	None	No Answer
General Studies	5	11	24	35
Subject-Matter Specialization	4	26	16	29
Courses in Professional Education	31	40	1	3

An attempt was made to probe the approach used in content development in order to comprehend the program changes described in Table 11; the results are shown below.

Table 12

Methods Used in Content Development

No. of Institutions	Method Used
40	Task analysis (observations of teachers teaching to develop competencies)
35	Studying the needs of children
34	Cluster approach (identification of curriculum areas, and deduction of behavioral objectives)
32	Reformulation of current courses
29	Use of competency lists formulated elsewhere
27	Theoretical approach
12	Other methods

In the write-in space provided some respondents noted that their programs had evolved from reformulation of courses to a cluster approach; others said they used competency lists formulated by their faculty and other

sources. One respondent said that the "development...of competencies for each course may vary from teacher to teacher."

Those groups and agencies named as having participated in curriculum development were varied, and dependent on the particular needs of each program. They included various specialists, Teacher Corps, faculty, public school personnel, students, community persons, Regional Labs, etc.

A three-part question followed concerning students and their field experiences. Responses to Part A, ("At what point is the student introduced to the classroom setting?") showed that students are in the classroom very early in their programs: 28 institutions indicated freshmen year, 14 - sophomore, 15 - junior and 2 - senior. Seven respondents said that this introduction varied according to the program, with allowances for transfer students and exceptional cases. Some emphasized that a student could be in a classroom as soon as he or she chose to do so. (Four institutions did not respond.) This was supported by Part C, ("What field experiences are available to your students?"), which revealed that 67 (89%) of the respondents offered field experiences.

Part B of this question, ("What is the length of time alloted for student teaching?") showed that the duration varies considerably. Most institutions indicated one semester, but with differing amounts of time—6, 8 or 10 weeks, and some have half day as opposed to all day programs. Only 9 programs said they had more than one year of student teaching.

Question #20 requested more detailed information on the strategies and methods used in the implementation of curriculums. The results are shown in the Table below.

Table 13

Response to Question #20—To what extent are each of the following used in your PBTE program?

	A Great Deal	%	Moderate	%	Rarely	%	Not At All	%	No Answer	%
Microteaching	21	28%	42	56%	5	7%	3	4%	4	5%
Classroom Observations	43	57%	25	33%	3	4%	2	3%	2	3%
Simulation	7	9%	38	51%	21	28%	3	4%	6	8%
Observation Schedules	12	16%	36	48%	14	19%	3	4%	10	13%
Instructional Modules	42	56%	22	29%	3	4%	2	3%	6	8%
Clusters	27	36%	20	27%	10	13%	5	7%	13	17%
Individualized Instruction	33	44%	31	41%	5	7%	1	1%	5	7%
Team Teaching	30	40%	33	44%	7	9%	1	1%	4	5%

If the first two columns in Table 13, "a great deal" and "moderate", are grouped together we see that five items are mentioned most frequently in PBTE training programs: microteaching
classroom observations
instructional modules
individualized instruction
team teaching.

It is also interesting to note that the low number and percent for simulation and observation schedules in the column labeled "a great deal" is in strong contrast to the other items. Simulation generally requires investment in equipment and therefore has a financial consideration, which, as will be pointed out later on, is a primary problem for PBTE programs. The modest use of observation schedules may also relate to fiscal problems, since they require extensive training.

The instructional module is the dominant unit being used in performance-based programs and as seen above, is indeed in heavy use. The next question, therefore, was a series of inquiries about them. (An instructional module was defined as "a set of learning activities—with objectives, prerequisites, pre-assessment, instructional activities, post-assessment, and remediation.") Of those respondents using modules, 35 institutions had less than 50, and 21 had more. One institution said it has 1,500 modules! Fifty-six, or all those responding to this question, said that some or all of their modules were developed locally. Those obtaining modules elsewhere generally indicated State Departments of Education and catalogs of competencies as their sources. Thirty-four institutions said their modules were field tested before implementation; 14 said theirs were not tested and 47 said that modules are currently being developed for their programs. One respondent wrote, "All are undergoing revision in accord with evaluation results." Another institution said it was "not sure 'modules' describes instructional strategy... more a one-to-one teaching/learning strategy," suggesting a lingering problem of definition.

The level of satisfaction of those institutions using instructional modules varied from very good (11) to inadequate (1), with the bulk (44) ranging in the middle, (19 - satisfactory, 13 - adequate and 14 - mixed.) Some respondents checked more than one response here, and 21 did not answer.

The numbers of modules in use and the numbers being developed underline the need for the coordination of module development, in the hope of future exchanges, or module "banks". Concern was expressed for the validation and assessment of all modules in use. In addition, although most respondents stressed localization, i.e., modules tailored to the needs of their own programs, many also noted a concern for some uniformity and quality. Limitations of fiscal resources hamper the development of modules in many of the responding institutions.

Forty-four institutions (59%) described other internal or external support services used in their PBTE programs; 8 (11%) used none with 13 (17%) not responding. Many respondents listed catalogs of competencies, AACTE conferences, State Department-sponsored workshops and visits to other campuses with PBTE programs, (e.g., Weber State, which was mentioned frequently). Others listed consultants, professional meetings, and interaction between centers. The State of Connecticut for example, has its own Clearinghouse for PBTE; another group, the Multi-State Consortium on PBTE, comprised of seven cooperating states, publishes a newsletter on PBTE. One respondent wrote in, "It's been trial and error." Another said, "On our budget you must be kidding."

A final question in the section on program characteristics asked for requirements for graduation. Some of the requirements listed are obviously all-university requirements, and not strictly those of a PBTE program, so there must be some qualification in the use of this response. The highest percentage, 83%, (62 institutions), checked "competencies completed", a

trait that would seem to be a necessity for a PBTE program. A minimum number of hours, on the other hand, is not wholly consistent with PBTE theory. Below is a Table of the responses.

Table 14

Graduation Requirements

	No. of Institutions	%
Competencies completed	62	83%
Minimum number of hours	52	69%
Supervisory evaluations	45	60%
Minimum GPA	41	55%
Criterion-referenced tests	20	27%
Microteaching evaluations	20	27%
Other	8	11%
Observation schedule analyses	6	8%

N.A. - 7 (9%)

Evaluation

The section on evaluation revealed a pressing need for the validation and assessment of performance-based programs—both the movement as a whole and its component parts. Many respondents expressed their concerns on this subject. (See Appendix C.)

The first four questions in this section dealt with evaluative methods used in modules. Both the questions and the answers follow:

26. Do your students have to meet a specified achievement level in each module?

Answer: Yes - 60 (80%)
No - 7 (9%)
N.A.- 8 (11%)

27. Do you have retraining or recycling procedures for those who do not reach competency levels?

Answer: Yes - 61 (81%)
No - 7 (9%)
N.A.- 7 (9%)

28. Is there a maximum number of trials allowed for competencies?

Answer: Yes - 10 (13%)
No - 56 (65%)
N.A.- 9 (12%)

29. Is there a maximum amount of time allowed?

Answer: Yes - 24 (32%)
No - 43 (57%)
N.A.- 8 (11%)

In the first three questions, there seems to be general agreement on module procedure. Only in question #29 is there any widespread disagreement expressed concerning the amount of time allowed for completion of the modules. One problem here would obviously concern the program's capacity to receive new students without setting some limits on those already enrolled. One respondent noted, "We have not found it necessary at this point. However, we do find that a number of students deselect themselves."

A question on the gathering of evidence to assess achievement levels of the modules (or other training programs) revealed the largest number of

institutions relying on observation, although there were no questions or explanations on the methods of observation used. The responses are listed below in order of preference:

Table 15

Frequency of Measures Used for Achievement Levels

	No. of Institutions	%
Observation	62	83%
Self-report	50	67%
Written tests	49	65%
Oral tests	42	56%
Other	20	27%

N.A. - 7 (9%)

Some of those checking "other" wrote in, "changes in pupil behavior", "cooperating teacher reports", and "performance on special projects".

The following question concerned the grading system(s) used. Here, the letter grade is still most prevalent, even though many of the model programs and descriptions say that incomplete/complete is the most accurate and appropriate way to measure competence. However, a grading system is generally an institutional requirement, and not the choice of a department or a program within that department, as some questionnaires specifically noted. Following are the numbers and percents for the responses to grading patterns.

Table 16

Grading Practices

Method	No. of Institutions	%
Letter grade	33	44%
Pass/Fail	25	33%
Varies	19	25%
Other	14	19%
Incomplete/Complete	10	13%
Negotiable	3	4%

An open question requesting a description as to how the department or program arrives at a synthesis of the individual student's skills after completing a PBTE program provoked varied responses. A few institutions noted that continuous monitoring and detailed evaluations of the students all along the way were necessary. Some programs indicated various contracts and/or check points, with conferences, interviews, and criterion-referenced evaluation. One institution said they use the collective judgments of the student, cooperating teacher from the public school and college faculty. Other respondents noted how difficult it was to arrive at a synthesis, saying that this was a continuing problem for them which they had not solved; 14 institutions did not answer the question at all.

A more specific three-part question on the evaluation of the entire PBTE program also showed interesting results. For curriculum review, the use of faculty and student committees was most common, as shown below:

Table 17

Curriculum Review

Method	No. of Institutions	%
Faculty committees	55	73%
Student committees	45	60%
Off campus personnel	26	35%
Other	19	25%

N.A. - 10 (13%)

Those checking "other", mentioned "state accrediting teams" and "internal and external evaluators". For review of faculty performance, student ratings were most heavily used:

Table 18

Faculty Performance Measures

Method	No. of Institutions	%
Student ratings	56	75%
Self-evaluation	42	56%
Classroom visitation	31	40%
Achievement test results	10	13%
Other	10	13%

N.A. - 8 (11%)

Additional notations cited "graduate student studies of programs" and the "extent to which students meet criteria". An increasing emphasis on graduate feedback for review of teacher training was also noted.

Eighty-four percent of the respondents do something related to studying the performance, satisfaction and whereabouts of their graduates, as seen below:

Table 19

Methods Used for Graduate Feedback

	No. of Institutions	%
Questionnaires	45	60%
Informal report	26	35%
On-site visits	23	31%
Other	9	12%

N.A. - 12 (16%)

"Group and individual interviews" and "Office of Teacher Placement reports", were among the things mentioned for "other".

Thirty institutions (40%) said that they have formal research or development programs in conjunction with their PBTE programs. Thirty-seven (49%) did not, with 8 (11%) not responding.

This third section ended with an open question asking what the institution's PBTE program needed most and the answers summarize most of the problems involved with PBTE. We added in parentheses, "Please do not say 'money', instead, state what the money would support." Most institutions still said money, which is clearly an overriding concern. (One said we took the fun out of it by adding that constraint!) Many institutions would like money for faculty release time, support materials, equipment, computer time and module development. Many emphasized the need for evaluative studies on the competencies in use, on performance-based

programs in general, and on the future possibilities and potential of this system. One respondent said they needed, "development of understanding of what PBTE and competency-based programs really are." Another said "increased staff to supervise field experiences, and money to conduct a comprehensive program of evaluation." (See Appendix C for further comments, page 41.)

Some of the final comments in the questionnaire express very well the enthusiasm and concern of the institutions sampled in the survey. "If we can solve...these problems, we feel that we can have a significant effect on the quality of education—far more than with a traditional course-oriented approach to...teacher education." And another said, "In CBTE the total teacher education faculty feels they are involved in a vital process of discovery and they are stimulated by the accompanying excitement of the search...."

CONCLUSION

This survey provides new data on the degree and extent of development of competency-based education programs. Among the 75 institutions in the sample, some are still in embryonic and experimental stages; others have attempted to change their entire teacher preparation curriculum over to a competency-based program. The numbers of students, faculty and separate PBTE programs vary considerably from institution to institution. The problems faced by the institutions, however, are similar: financial support, faculty allocations and instructional development. According to the responses to the questions on program characteristics, the theory, the approach and the objectives of these programs are generally similar. The differences lie in the specific instructional strategies being used and their implementation. These programs responding have clearly spent a great deal of time and money on the development of modules and other program materials. There is, in addition, an increasing degree of exchange and cooperation between the schools, faculties and professional associations, as institutions continue to develop their programs and want to share information and keep up with the literature and the research.

A major concern of almost all the institutions reporting is the evaluation of their students, modules and programs. Rosner has written that "No factor is more crucial to the success of competency-based

education than the method of assessing the mastery of concepts and skills."[2] The comments added by many respondents noted this, stressing the difficulties involved in developing or obtaining good evaluative measures.

Nonetheless, the enthusiasm for this approach to teacher education is widespread. "Some people believe that CBTE is just another development which will fade away into the oblivion of educational faddism," Karl Massanari has written in the Fall Journal of Teacher Education.[3] "On the other hand some of us believe that CBTE—given intelligent leadership and adequate development and research support can generate the kinds of reform so long sought and now so urgently needed." The movement is well under way according to the data from these institutions; an awareness of faddism is generally evident, but the excitement and preliminary sense of accomplishment is also very strong.

2. Rosner, B., The Power of Competency-Based Education: a report, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, Mass., 1972, p.30.

3. op. cit., p.247.

APPENDIX A

PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION (PBTE) QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTITUTION _____

PUBLIC _____ PRIVATE _____ SIZE (TOTAL STUDENT POPULATION) _____

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN EDUCATION _____

NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE:

_____

GENERAL DATA

1. Please indicate below whether you have a PBTE program, a "traditional" program, or another form of experimental program in the following areas. Where applicable, please indicate how many PBTE programs are currently offered.

Programs	PBTE	Number	"Traditional"	Other
Nursery-Kindergarten	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]
Early Childhood (grades 1-3)	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]
Elementary (grades 4-8)	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]
Secondary	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]
Special Education	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]
Guidance Counseling	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]
Graduate Level				
_____	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]
_____	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]
Other				
_____	[ ]	_____	[ ]	[ ]

Copyright © 1973 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

2. How many students are presently in PBTE programs in your institution? _____

3. How many students have completed PBTE programs? _____
   [ ] None.

4. How long have your PBTE programs been in operation? _____

5. How many faculty and staff are involved full-time in performance-based programs? (Please use full-time equivalents, e.g., 4 people @ quarter time = 1.) _____

6. Please indicate what kind of retraining program, or accessibility to retraining, you have for faculty involved in your programs?

   [ ] Seminars
   [ ] Informal meetings
   [ ] Other (please describe)
   [ ] Conferences
   [ ] None

   _____

   _____

7. Please describe the training programs you have for classroom teachers involved in PBTE programs? [ ] None.

   _____

   _____

   _____

8. Are you engaged in, or operating, a teaching center (i.e., a coordinating site for teacher education where performance criteria are formulated, supervised and evaluated, and/or where research and development are undertaken), or a consortium arrangement?

   [ ] Engaged in [ ] Planning [ ] No

   Please specify with whom or with which groups you are involved.

   _____

   _____

9. Has your training program been evaluated and approved by the State Board of Education?

[ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] On a pilot basis

10. Please indicate below what kinds of problems were encountered in changing from one type of program to another.

[ ] Space problems
[ ] Equipment
[ ] Faculty allocations
[ ] Financial support
[ ] Cooperation of institution
[ ] Other (please describe)

_____

_____

_____

_____

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

11. At what stage in his/her academic career does a student apply for entry into a PBTE program?

[ ] Freshmen [ ] Sophmore [ ] Junior [ ] Senior
[ ] Graduate [ ] Varies

12. How does a student gain <u>entry</u> into the program?

[ ] Self-selection
[ ] Recommendations
[ ] Interview
[ ] Other (specify)
[ ] Minimum GPA
[ ] Counseling
[ ] Examinations (specify)

_____

_____

13. Do you have a statement of goals, or a rationale, for your overall PBTE program? (If available, please enclose a copy.)

[ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] In process

14. Are the expressed objectives of your program classified in any of the following ways?

[ ] Cognitive (participant is required to demonstrate knowledge and intellectual abilities).
[ ] Performance-based (participant is required to do something rather than simply know something).
[ ] Consequence-based (participant is required to bring about specified performance and/or change in others).
[ ] Other (please describe) _____

_____

15. On the following check-list, please indicate which characteristics are basic to your PBTE program.

Competencies (knowledge, skills, behaviors) demonstrated by the student are:

[ ] derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles.
[ ] stated so as to permit assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies.
[ ] made public in advance.

Criteria employed in assessing competencies are:

[ ] based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies.
[ ] explicit in stating expected levels of mastery and under specified conditions.
[ ] made public in advance.

Assessment of the student's competency:

[ ] uses his/her performance as the primary source of evidence.
[ ] takes into account student's knowledge relevant to teaching and learning behavior.
[ ] strives for objectivity.

Other elements:

[ ] The student's rate of progress through the program is demonstrated competency rather than by time or course completion.
[ ] The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified.
[ ] The emphasis is on exit, not on entrance, requirements.
[ ] The program is field-centered.
[ ] Instruction moves from mastery of specified techniques to role integration.

16. Which of the following areas of your program are performance-based?

	All	Some	None	% (if determined)
General studies	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	_____
Subject matter specialization	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	_____
All courses in the Professional Education sequence	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	_____

17. What approach do you use in content development? (Please check wherever applicable.)

[ ] Reformulation of current courses.
[ ] Task analysis (observations of teachers teaching to develop competencies).
[ ] Studying the needs of children.
[ ] Theoretical approach.
[ ] Cluster approach (identification of curriculum areas, and deduction of behavioral objectives).
[ ] Use of competency lists formulated elsewhere.
[ ] Other methods (please describe).

_____

_____

18. If you have developed your own curriculum as described in 17, please indicate who has been involved in this process.

_____

_____

19. a. At what point in your program is the student introduced to the classroom setting? _____

b. What is the length of time allotted for student teaching?

_____

c. What other field experiences are available to your students?

_____

20. To what extent are each of the following used in your PBTE programs?

	A great deal	Moderately	Rarely	Not at all
Microteaching	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Classroom observations	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Simulation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Observation schedules	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Instructional modules	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Clusters (a group of related modules)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Individualized instruction	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Team teaching	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

21. If, as indicated in 20, you use instructional modules (defined as "a set of learning activities--with objectives, prerequisites, pre-assessment, instructional activities, post-assessment, and remediation,") please answer the questions below:

a. What is the total number of modules used in your program(s)? _____

b. Of these, how many were developed locally? _____

c. Where did you obtain the others? _____

d. How many were field-tested before implementation? _____

e. How many modules are currently being developed for your program(s)? _____

22. If you use modules extensively, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the modules currently in use:

[ ] Very good [ ] Satisfactory [ ] Adequate [ ] Mixed
[ ] Inadequate

23. Have you developed or modified training materials, other than instructional modules, for your program?

[ ] Yes [ ] No (describe) _____

_____

24. What other internal or external support services have you used (e.g., existing catalogue of competencies, outside consultants, State Departments of Education, etc.)?

_____

_____

_____

25. Which of the following requirements do you use for graduation from your program?

[ ] Minimum number of hours
[ ] Competencies completed
[ ] Supervisory evaluations
[ ] Criterion-referenced tests
[ ] Minimum GPA
[ ] Microteaching evaluations
[ ] Observation schedule analyses
[ ] Other (please specify)

_____

EVALUATION

26. Do your students have to meet a specified achievement level in each module? [ ] Yes [ ] No.

27. Do you have retraining (or recycling) procedures for those who do not reach competency levels? [ ] Yes [ ] No.

28. Is there a maximum number of trials allowed for competencies?
[ ] Yes [ ] No.

29. Is there a maximum amount of time allowed? [ ] Yes [ ] No.

30. What evidence on evaluation of behavior is gathered to assess achievement levels of the modules, or other forms of training?

[ ] Observation
[ ] Self-report
[ ] Written tests
[ ] Oral tests
[ ] Other (Please specify) _____

_____

31. What kind of grading system(s) do you use?

[ ] Letter-grade
[ ] Varies
[ ] Pass-fail
[ ] Negotiable
[ ] Incomplete-complete
[ ] Other (specify) _____

_____

32. How do you arrive at a synthesis of the individual student's skills after he/she has gone through your program?

_____

_____

_____

33. How do you evaluate your PBTE program?

a. Curriculum review by:

[ ] Faculty committees
[ ] Student committees
[ ] Off-campus personnel
[ ] Other (specify) _____

_____

b. Faculty performance measures:

[ ] Classroom visitation
[ ] Achievement test results
[ ] Student ratings
[ ] Self-evaluation
[ ] Other (specify) _____

_____

c. Graduate feedback:

[ ] Informal report
[ ] Questionnaires
[ ] On-site visits
[ ] Other (specify) _____

_____

34. Do you have formal research or development programs in conjunction with your PBTE program? [ ] Yes [ ] No.

35. What would be most helpful to you in developing your PBTE program? (Please do not say "money," instead, state what the money would support.)

_____

_____

_____

36. Please give name of person to contact for information on PBTE (if other than name on cover sheet).

_____

37. Please add any comments desired.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU

APPENDIX B

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 293-2450

May 4, 1973

Dear Colleague:

Your institution participated in a preliminary survey about performance-based teacher education conducted last fall by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. That survey revealed 131 teacher education institutions with one or more programs which met the criteria for PBTE as defined by Elam in PBTE: What Is the State of the Art? (AACTE, 1971). In the response from your institution--which is one of the 131--you were designated as the individual best able to discuss the progress of PBTE in your institution.

The Association's Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education would now like to gather more extensive information on these 131 programs in order to build up our depository of information about PBTE, and to provide current information for the Committee and the total educational community.

Several other national organizations with which AACTE has worked closely are very interested in determining the current state of the art. One such organization is the Educational Testing Service which includes a group of researchers and program directors responsible for teacher behavior research and programs. The research in teaching now going on at ETS concentrates on developing evaluation processes for performance-based programs. Both AACTE and ETS are involved with the proposed national Commission on Performance-Based Education. A year-long feasibility study, recently completed, recommended establishing such a commission to act as an information clearing-house and research stimulus for PBTE.

We felt that a survey which combined the interests described above would save time for all parties, but especially for the respondents. An analysis of the survey results will be sent to all respondents; the present schedule calls for a preliminary report to be mailed by approximately June 15.

We thank you for your cooperation.

James R. Deneen

James R. Deneen, Director
Teacher Programs and Services
Educational Testing Service

Karl Massanari

Karl Massanari, Director
Performance-Based Teacher
Education Project and
Associate Director, AACTE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 293-2450

May 31, 1973

Dear Colleague:

Your institution participated in a preliminary survey about performance-based teacher education conducted last fall by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. That survey revealed 131 teacher education institutions with one or more programs which met the criteria for PBTE as defined by Elam in PBTE: What is the State of the Art? (AACTE, 1971). In the response from your institution--which is one of the 131--you were designated as the individual best able to discuss the progress of PBTE in your institution.

The Association's Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education in conjunction with Educational Testing Service would now like to gather more extensive information on these 131 programs in order to build up our depository of information about PBTE, and to provide current information for the Committee and the total educational community.

We have not yet received your response to our earlier mailing of May 4, and are therefore sending out this second request. If we have crossed in the mails, please forgive us; we are concerned with providing the most complete reporting possible.

The cut-off date for this survey is June 10. An analysis of the survey results will be sent to all respondents.

We thank you for your cooperation.

James R. Deneen

James R. Deneen, Director
Teacher Programs and Services
Educational Testing Service

Karl Massanari

Karl Massanari, Director
Performance-Based Teacher
Education Project and
Associate Director, AACTE

Appendix C

Sample comments from Questions 35 and 37:

35. What would be most helpful to your program...?

"Research personnel to develop the techniques to evaluate our product effectively."

"The things that money would purchase! i.e., In-Service time for professional personnel. Think Time. Travel to visit other programs. Increased secretarial help to develop modules. The cost of producing a module (not revision, etc.) is over $1,000."

"Faculty personnel; transportation for student to teaching centers; more incentives for the teachers in the schools to cooperate, such as leaves, released time, attendance at conferences."

"Improved integration of program with other parts of Teachers Colleges and Arts and Sciences programs; improved monitoring and research services, funded planning time for improvement of materials and revision of same; released time for staff and teachers for dual planning."

"An analytical study of "consequences" to reduce the proliferating competencies. If we don't synthesize, we are going to pollute the effort."

"Time for developing and researching CBTE materials; confering; video-tape materials; inservice education for all personnel."

"Study of differences attributable to PBTE programs compared with matched paired control group...."

37. Open comments:

"CBTE will not survive unless dissemination is better (people not hoarding) and there is financial support. Accessibility is just too difficult."

"...we feel that we can have a significant effect on the quality of education—far more than with a traditional course-oriented approach to graduate teacher education."

"It's the only way to fly!"